



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	36287-02001	2495

27171 7590 05/24/2006

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

EXAMINER

GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,403

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on April 6, 2006. Claims 1, 9-13, 17 and 20 have been amended. New claim 22 has been added. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. In view of the amendment filed April 6, 2006, the Examiner withdraws the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on April 6, 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 9-13, 17, 20 and 22 recite,

“determining at the second system whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the first system, so as to authenticate at the second system”. The applicant has disclosed “determining at the first system if the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system”. The applicant in the original application at the time of the filing has not described “determining at the second system whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the first system”

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The claim recite the step of “the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system” followed by “the first system determining whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system”. There appears to be a missing step, because it is unclear how or what is communicated from the second system to the first system that would enable the first system to determine whether the client has a valid session credential.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2137

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. (hereinafter Howard) U.S. Patent 6,584,505 in view of Wood et al. (hereinafter Wood) United States Patent Number 6,668,322.

As per claims 1, 9-11 and 22:

Howard teaches a method for validating credentials comprising:

determining, at a first system that grants session credential based on successful authentication at the first system or successful authentication at a second system, that a client does not have a valid session credential by the first system; (col. 6, lines 46-50; col. 8, lines 41-43)

retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for the second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system; (col. 6, lines 51-52)

the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 54-57) and

the first system determining whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system; and (col. 8, lines 2-7; col. 8, lines 41-43; col. 8, line 66-col. 9, line 6)

determining at the second system whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the first system, so as to authenticate at the second system. (col. 9, lines 16-23)

Howard does not explicitly disclose a session token. Wood in analogous art, however, discloses a session token. (col. 3, lines 2-12) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Howard with Wood in order to provide a system that allows inspection of credentials by a wide variety of entities or application to an authenticated trust level while preventing alteration except by a trusted authentication service.

(Abstract, Wood)

As per claims 2 and 14:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method comprising granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system. (col. 8, line 66-col. 9, line 6)

As per claims 3:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Wood teaches a method comprising sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system. (col. 3, lines 5-13)

As per claim 4:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a

Art Unit: 2137

valid session credential granted by the second system. (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 54-57)

As per claim 5:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method comprising directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system. (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 54-57)

As per claims 6 and 15:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method comprising maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system. (col. 9, lines 6-14)

As per claim 7:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method wherein determining whether the client has a valid credential with the second system is at least partially from presenting at least some of the information from the session token. (col. 6, lines 51-52)

As per claim 8:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard teaches a method wherein retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name

Art Unit: 2137

corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query. (col. 8, lines 8-11)

As per claim 12:

Howard teaches a programmed computer for validating credentials, comprising:
a memory having at least one region for storing computer executable program code; (Figure 1) and

a processor for executing the program code stored in the memory, (Figure 1)
wherein the program code comprises:

code to determine, at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the first system or successful authentication at a second system, that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system; (col. 6, lines 46-50; col. 8, lines 41-43)

code to retrieve, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system; (col. 6, lines 51-52)

code to present at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (col. 6, lines 51-52; col. 8, lines 54-57) and

code to determine whether the client has a valid session credential with the second system. (col. 8, lines 2-7; col. 8, lines 41-43; col. 8, line 66-col. 9, line 6)

code to determine at the second system whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the first system, so as to authenticate at the second system. (col. 9, lines 16-23)

Howard does not explicitly disclose a session token. Wood in analogous art, however, discloses a session token. (col. 3, lines 2-12) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Howard with Wood in order to provide a system that allows inspection of credentials by a wide variety of entities or application to an authenticated trust level while preventing alteration except by a trusted authentication service. (Abstract, Wood)

As per claims 13, 17 and 20:

Howard teaches a method for establishing session credentials comprising:
determining that a client does not have a valid session credential for a first system based on successful authentication at the first system or successful authentication at a second system; (col. 6, lines 46-50; col. 8, lines 41-43)

determining that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system based on based on successful authentication at the second system; (col. 6, line 54-col. 7, line 15)

sending, from the fist system to the client , a log in page; (col. 8, lines 2-11)

receving, at the first system from the client, a log in page; (col. 8, lines 2-11)

sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; (col. 7, lines 54-col. 8, line 11) and

Art Unit: 2137

receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information and successful authentication at the second system. (col. 8, lines 2-7; col. 8, lines 41-43; col. 8, line 66- col. 9, line 6)

Howard does not explicitly disclose a session token. Wood in analogous art, however, discloses a session token. (col. 3, lines 2-12) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Howard with Wood in order to provide a system that allows inspection of credentials by a wide variety of entities or application to an authenticated trust level while preventing alteration except by a trusted authentication service.

(Abstract, Wood)

As per claims 16 and 19:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard further discloses a method comprising associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client. (col. 7, lines 12-25)

As per claim 21:

The combination of Howard and Wood teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Howard further discloses a method comprising granting the client session credentials for the first system. (col. 7, lines 54-63)

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay
5/19/06


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER